

Draft proposed letter to Church. Take any liberties you want then send

and now represent

I have represented Harold Weisberg, of Frederick, Md., in several Freedom of Information cases and in other matters. I write you at his request.

He has read S.Res 21 with care and has come to believe that he is in possession of documentation that falls within the purview of your committee. Prior to his reading of this resolution, after receiving a document that had previously been classified "TOP SECRET" Mr. Weisberg consulted with an experienced correspondent he trusts and gave this correspondent a copy of the document to read. The correspondent immediately told Mr. Weisberg he ought give you a copy. I concur in this view.

also

We both feel that some of the material Mr. Weisberg has obtained is important to your committee and its ability to discharge its responsibilities.

In addition, we are both also deeply concerned about current sensational and irrational charges being made. One of their ~~unintentional~~ effects, whether or not intended, can be to interfere with your investigation and waste time for the staff, Members or both and ^{thus} ~~and~~ further interfere with the investigation.

Mr. Weisberg knows some of those making these spurious charges personally and has had contact with others. His efforts to discourage ~~him~~ what he regards as their utter irresponsibility have been unsuccessful and these people are repeating the same charges after Mr. Weisberg pointed out that they cannot be substantiated and lack reasonableness. He is therefore additionally distressed because his work for the past decade convinces him that your committee is essential to the health and proper functioning of executive agencies he considers essential as it convinces him of the urgent national need for your investigation and its success.

He has asked me to write to make an appointment with your or anyone you designate for the delivery of the initial material he believes you should have and for any discussion you of your designee may wish to have on other matters that in your judgement may be appropriate to your responsibilities.

Mr. Weisberg has been an investigative reporter, a Senate investigator and an intelligence analyst. He is best known for having done most of the writing on the John Kennedy assassination, beginning with the first book on the Warren Commission.

2

I am associated with him in the fourth of his Whitewash series, having written a legal analysis published in it. I represented him in the suit which produced the 90 formerly "TOP SECRET" pages that are the basis of that book. I regard this as the most bizarre of Freedom of Information suits. (You may also remember that Weisberg v. Department of Justice is the first of four suits cited in Senate debate on May 30, 1974, as requiring amending of the investigatory-files exemption. I did the appeals work in that case.)

I know of no serious challenge to any of Mr. Weisberg's work, either his writing or in court. Percy Foreman once fled a TV studio rather than confront him, after flying all the way to New York for the free publicity.

As counsel to James Earl Ray/I personally handled the results of Mr. Weisberg's investigation in ~~summar~~ an evidentiary hearing ordered by the sixth circuit court of appeals. Before the appeals court and in the evidentiary hearing Mr. Weisberg's work was completely substantiated. The State, in fact, elected not to challenge almost 100% of it. Where Mr. Weisberg laid the most serious charges against the FBI it and the State of Tennessee elected complete silence. We produced expert testimony to support Mr. Weisberg's charges and it, too, was neither cross-examined nor rebutted. Recently I was at a meeting with Mr. Weisberg and an FBI he had accused of swearing falsely. The agent was without complaint or protest of any kind.

I go into these ~~things~~ credentials of which I have personal knowledge because of the allegations Mr. Weisberg has asked me to ~~smke~~ about other.

As his lawyer I have ~~had~~ him in direct sworn contradiction to a former Solicitor General of the United States. The court upheld Mr. Weisberg and his proof in the not commonplace, ~~the proving of a negative~~ the proving of a negative. It had to do with the false claim to "national security" classification.

JL: you may elect to eliminate the last part. Whatever you think. I have a purpose and I would welcome the chance to lay it on the Yipsters, the Webermans and the Gregorian chanters (not Groden) who could not now better serve the spooks than they are.